Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, 32, and 34-37 are pending in the application. In the Office Action Summary of April 6, 2006, the Examiner states that claims 12, 17, 21, 26, 30, and 33 are withdrawn. However, Applicants note claims 12, 21, 26, 30, and 33 have been canceled, and claim 17 is pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, 32, and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Housel III (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,869)("Housel")* in view of *Megiddo, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,957,224)("Megiddo")*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner's disposition below.

<u>Regarding claims 1-8, 14-22, 28, 35, and 37:</u>

Independent claims 1, 14, 15, 28, 35, and 37 each claim subject matter relating to receiving a first uniform resource locator ("URL") of a first length. The first URL corresponds to data identified by a data transmission request expression (*e.g.,* a URL) of a second type. The first URL is replaced with a replacement URL having a second length. The data is retrieved using the replacement URL.

This is clearly unlike *Housel* in view of *Megiddo*, which fails to disclose or suggest replacing a first URL having a first length with a second URL having a second length to retrieve data. *Housel* teaches two ways to retrieve data: 1) using a URL or 2) using a hash record key. *Housel* explains that a hash record key is typically much shorter than a URL. *Housel*, 8:56-67.

Unlike Applicants' claimed invention, nowhere does *Housel* disclose or suggest replacing a first URL with a replacement URL to retrieve data. In fact, *Housel* fails to teach replacing its URL with anything. The Examiner argues that *Housel* replaces its URL with a hashed record key. *Office Action of 4/6/2006*, page 3. However, *Housel* makes no such teaching. Instead, *Housel* merely teaches that a hash record key (which is not a URL) may be used <u>instead of</u> a URL. *Housel* 8:65-67. *Housel* does not replace its URL with a hash record key.

Megiddo discloses shorthand links that are associated with registered URLs. *Megiddo* 2:47-49. Unlike Applicants' claimed invention, nowhere does *Megiddo* disclose or suggest replacing a first URL with a replacement URL to retrieve data. Therefore, *Housel* in view of *Megiddo* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 1 and 15.

Claims 2-6, 8, 16-20, and 22 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 15 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 15 are allowable.

<u>Regarding claims 29-31:</u>

Independent claim 29 claims subject matter relating to receiving a first uniform resource locator ("URL") of a first length. The first URL corresponds to data identified by a data transmission request expression (*e.g.,* a URL) of a first type. The first URL is replaced with a replacement URL having a second length. The data is retrieved using the replacement URL.

This is clearly unlike *Housel* in view of *Megiddo,* which fails to disclose or suggest replacing a first URL having a first length with a second URL having a second length to retrieve data. *Housel* teaches two ways to retrieve data: 1) using a URL or 2) using a hash record key. *Housel* explains that a hash record key is typically much shorter than a URL. *Housel,* 8:56-67.

Unlike Applicants' claimed invention, nowhere does *Housel* disclose or suggest replacing a first URL with a replacement URL to retrieve data. In fact, *Housel* fails to teach replacing its URL with anything. The Examiner argues that *Housel* replaces its URL with a hashed record key. *Office Action of 4/6/2006,* page 3. However, *Housel* makes no such teaching. Instead, *Housel* merely teaches that a hash record key (which is not a URL) may be used <u>instead of</u> a URL. *Housel* 8:65-67. *Housel* does not replace its URL with a hash record key.

Megiddo discloses shorthand links that are associated with registered URLs. *Megiddo* 2:47-49. Unlike Applicants' claimed invention, nowhere does *Megiddo* disclose or suggest replacing a first URL with a replacement URL to retrieve data. Therefore, *Housel* in view of *Megiddo* still fails to disclose or suggest claim 29.

Claim 31 depends directly or indirectly from claim 29 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 29 is allowable.

<u>Regarding claims 9-13, 23-27, 32-34, and 36:</u>

Independent claims 9, 23, 32, and 36 each claim subject matter relating to a retrieved data having a first uniform resource locator ("URL") of a first length. The first URL is replaced with a replacement URL having a second length. The retrieved data with the replacement URL is sent to a requestor.

This is clearly unlike *Housel* in view of *Megiddo,* which fails to disclose or suggest a retrieved data that includes a first URL having a first length that is replaced with a second URL having a second length. *Housel* teaches that data can be retrieved using a URL. *Housel,* 8:56-67. However, nowhere does *Housel* suggest that data can *include* a first URL having a first length that is replaced with a second URL having a second length. In fact, nowhere does *Housel* discuss replacing a URL with another URL, let alone replacing a URL that is within retrieved

data.

The Examiner argues that *Housel* replaces its URL with a hashed record key. *Office Action of 4/6/2006*, page 3. However, *Housel* makes no such teaching. Instead, *Housel* merely teaches that a hash record key (which is not a URL) may be used instead of a URL. *Housel* 8:65-67. *Housel* does not replace its URL with a hash record key.

Megiddo discloses shorthand links that are associated with registered URLs. *Megiddo* 2:47-49. Unlike Applicants' claimed invention, nowhere does *Megiddo* disclose or suggest replacing a first URL with a replacement URL to retrieve data. Therefore, *Housel* in view of *Megiddo* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 9, 23, 32, and 36.

Claims 10, 11, 13, 24, 25, 27, and 34 depend directly or indirectly from claims 9, 23, or 32 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 9, 23, and 32 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

13

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, 32, and 34-37. are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  /Christopher P. Rauch/   (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHEIN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #26263
Attorneys for Applicant(s)